

Peter S. Schweda  
Waldo, Schweda & Montgomery, P.S.  
2206 North Pines Road  
Spokane, WA 99206  
509/924-3686  
Fax: 509/922-2196  
[pschweda@wsmattorneys.com](mailto:pschweda@wsmattorneys.com)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
Plaintiff, ) No. 4:15-cr-6049-EFS-16  
vs. ) DEFENDANT EDGAR OMAR  
EDGAR OMAR HERRERA FARIAS, ) HERRERA FARIAS' REPLY TO  
Defendant. ) RESPONSE TO MOTION IN  
 ) LIMINE RE: MODUS  
 ) OPERANDI TESTIMONY  
 ) Hearing: March 6, 2018 @ 9:30  
 ) a.m. at Richland  
 ) WITH ORAL ARGUMENT

The Defendant, Edgar Omar Herrera Farias, replies to the Government's Consolidated Response to Defendants' Motion in Limine ECF No. 650 as it pertains to law enforcement modus operandi experts.

The Government maintains that law enforcement may state opinions under FRE 701 because they are “permitted to draw certain conclusions based upon their training and experience” ECF No. 650 at 2. If the officers are relying on their specialized training and expertise, their opinions might come in because their “specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence” but only if it is expert

1 testimony under FRE 702, not lay opinions under FRE 701. FRE 702(a). Lay opinions  
 2 under FRE 701 are “rationally based on the witness’ perception” and “not based on  
 3 scientific, technical or other specialized knowledge.” FRE 701(a) and (c). The  
 4 proposed officer testimony is not lay opinion.  
 5

6 Therefore, any law enforcement modus operandi testimony must meet the  
 7 requirements of FRE 702. *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S.  
 8 579 (1993).

9 Moreover, the Court must consider the important role of FRE 403 by weighing  
 10 the probative value against the prejudicial effect of any proffered evidence before its  
 11 admission. *United States v. Sangrey*, 586 F.2d 1312, 1315 (9th Cir. 1978). The Court  
 12 must clearly demonstrate “that the question of prejudice figured crucially in the court’s  
 13 admission. *United States v. Verduzco*, 373 F.3d 1022, 1029 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2004).

14 Here, the Government’s disclosures do not demonstrate how the modus  
 15 operandi expert “testimony helps the trier of fact to understand how ‘combinations of  
 16 seemingly innocuous events may indicate criminal behavior.’” *United States v.*  
 17 *Vallejo*, 237 F.3d 1008, 1016 (9th Cir. 2001), quoting *United States v. Johnson*, 735  
 18 F.2d 1200, 1202 (9th Cir. 1984). For example, the Government’s Supplemental as to  
 19 the Proposed Modus Operandi Expert talks in vague terms such as “pricing and  
 20 trafficking pattern of heroin” and Fentanyl will be explained without disclosing the  
 21 explanation and that Canadian Constable experts will “explain why” distribution hubs  
 22

1 typically send product to Vancouver B.C. without disclosing "why." ECF No. 595 at  
2  
3 4.

5 The Court should prohibit drug modus operandi testimony at trial.  
6  
7

8 RESPECTFULLY submitted this 27<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.  
9  
10

11 WALDO, SCHWEDA  
12 & MONTGOMERY, P.S.  
13 By: /s/ Peter S. Schweda  
14 PETER S. SCHWEDA  
15 Attorney for Defendant Herrera Farias  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 27, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Joseph H. Harrington  
Acting United States Attorney  
Eastern District of Washington  
Stephanie Van Marter  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Eastern District of Washington  
300 United States Courthouse  
PO Box 1494  
Spokane, WA 99210

By: /s/ KATHLEEN SCHROEDER  
Legal Assistant to Peter S. Schweda